

Document Prepared by - Return to:
christopher robert weast-Private Citizen
C/o temporary post location
833 Hallvale Drive
Fort Worth, Texas 76108

To: Jerry V. Beard; Christopher A. Curtis; Angela Saad

SPECIAL AND PRIVATE LETTER ROGATORY

Despite my numerous requests for you to do so and my ongoing statements to you that there were documents that would exonerate the defendant/respondent on the unfounded and unproven allegations and charges and subsequent convictions based on, by your own words, "presumptions and assumptions" on the part of the Court and the prosecution/plaintiff that were not rebutted and so stand presumptively as agreement of the facts in this case between the parties.

It has been confusing to me and puzzling as to how a person can be found guilty of a crime without any substantial evidence being brought by the prosecution/plaintiff. Furthermore, I recall at the nomination hearings to the United States Supreme Court of Mr. Bork a number of years back, Mr. Bork stated on record that 99 per cent of everyone in jail on a criminal conviction are there at their own agreement or words to that effect. After some objective inquiry and unsolicited commentary, I find it necessary to write this letter, which I will call a special and private Letter Rogatory to solicit your help in resolving this matter. Please respond to me in writing within ten (10) days of receipt hereof, if you have any evidence or counterclaim as to anything that might be incorrect in the following presentation and documentation.

Your failure to respond with a supported counterclaim will constitute your acceptance/admission and consent with the undersigned in this matter.

THE UNDERSIGNED'S CLAIM

MAJOR PREMISE: There was no substantive evidence presented by the prosecution/plaintiff against the defendant in case number 4:14-CR-00023 in United States District Court or United States Supreme Court to

prove that the defendant committed a crime - all the facts presented by the prosecution were assumptive and presumptive of the facts that were associated with an "alleged crime".

MINOR PREMISE: The defence failed to rebut the assumptive and presumptive facts, so the assumed and presumed facts stand as truth. Therefore, the defendant has voluntarily consented and agreed with the prosecution's assumed and presumed facts as offered by tacit admissions'. The facts are not in dispute by 'agreement of the parties' whether they are true or not.

Conclusion: The tacit admission of the facts by the defendant can only result in a finding of guilty by the court by the 'agreement of the parties' and not as a judgment in law based upon substantial evidence.

A. Have I not now discovered that this nation is no longer under a system of law in the public that was in existence when the nation was founded, in which the defendant is presumed to be innocent until proven guilty? Is it not true that a defendant in court on a criminal charge in 'THIS STATE' is now presumed and assumed to be guilty by the charging facts in the case unless and until the defendant proves himself innocent by rebutting these facts?

Your response is acceptance/admission herewith unless you respond with supported evidence to the contrary.

B. Is it not true that since 1933 there is no lawful money of substance circulating in the public by sanction of public law, and so there can be no judicial proceedings in law, since in law requires the ability to provide a remedy at execution in lawful money of substance which does not exist in public policy?

Your response is acceptance/admission herewith unless you respond with supported evidence to the contrary.

C. Is it not true that civil and criminal proceedings in the courts of 'THIS STATE' are de-facto and based upon private commercial contract law proceedings between the plaintiff/prosecution and the defendant/respondent?

Your response is acceptance/admission herewith unless you respond with supported evidence to the contrary.

D. Is it not true then that the Criminal/Family/Supreme/District/Magistrate Court in 'THIS STATE' in this case did not try this case by bringing substantive evidence, but rather, was relying upon an agreement of the parties by the hopeful failure of the defendant/respondent to rebut the assumptions and presumptions of the charging facts?

Your response is acceptance/admission herewith unless you respond with supported evidence to the contrary.

E. Is it not true that you, as legal counsel appointed for the defendant, made a statement to the defendant that the prosecution did not have any evidence, and you as the defense legal counsel, would mount evidence in chief to defeat the charges?

Your response is acceptance/admission herewith unless you respond with supported evidence to the contrary.

F. Is it not true that the defendant told you repeatedly that he is innocent and yet you never once asserted defendant's innocence and instead, you chose an alleged 'defense' that agreed with the charging facts?

Your response is acceptance/admission herewith unless you respond with supported evidence to the contrary.

MINOR PREMISE: In this case, you did not put on a 'case-in-chief', to rebut the false assumptions and presumptions of the criminal charges against the defendant, that would have required the prosecution to present substantive evidence to prove the charges.


CONCLUSION: You are either grossly incompetent in assisting the defendant in this case, or else you acted maliciously and with intent to keep the defendant/undersigned from bringing a necessary and sufficient defence in this matter.

MINOR PREMISE: You were not effective in your assistance of counsel in this case, because you were either incompetent, or malicious in failing to represent the defendant by assisting in rebutting the assumed and presumed facts and charges against the defendant


when the undersigned was willing and able to testify by negative averment and present facts by way of admissible evidence to demonstrate that the assumed and presumed charges were not true.


CONCLUSION: The defendant was denied effective assistance of counsel in this case, and the judgment in this case should be set aside based on incompetent assistance of counsel and then some facts in support of that.

Your response is acceptance/admission herewith unless you respond with supported evidence to the contrary.


Christopher Robert Weast
C/o temporary post location
833 Hallvale Drive
Fort Worth, Texas 76108

CC: John McBryde; Julie Harwell; Clerk of Court

 c/c
08/05/2015



christopher-robert. weast
47797177
% Federal Correctional Institution
P.O. Box 1500
El Reno, Oklahoma 73036

Special
and
Private
Legal
Mail

Julie Harwell

47797-177

Julie Harwell
501 W 10TH ST
Special and Private
FORT Worth, TX 76102
United States

Clerk

Room 310

NORTHERN DIST. OF TEX.
FT WORTH DIVISION
2015 NOV -9 PM 12:09
CLERK OF COURT



12411

Forwarded through
the forwarding
agency. The writer raised a
question or problem over which facility has
jurisdiction. You may wish to return this
material for further information and
clarification. If the writer enclosed
correspondence for forwarding to another
addressee, please return the enclosure to
the above address.

The enclosed letter was processed through
special mailing procedures for forwarding
to you. The letter has been neither opened
nor inspected. If the writer raised a
question or problem over which facility has
jurisdiction, you may wish to return this
material for further information and
clarification. If the writer enclosed
correspondence for forwarding to another
addressee, please return the enclosure to
the above address.

Returned for Labe 1
MLT